



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/310,165	05/10/1999	YASSIR K. ELLEY	SMY-013.01	8445

45774 7590 11/30/2005  
KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP  
ONE STATE STREET, SUITE 800  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/310,165

Applicant(s)

ELLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher A. Revak

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-128 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-128 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 5/10/99 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 9, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant has argued that it is not taught by the combination of Gasser and Parker that "the presenter of credentials....presents to the recipient of credentials one or more chains of group credentials that prove that presenter's membership in the nested group". The examiner respectfully disagrees, the teachings of Gasser are relied upon for disclosing of credentials that include nested groups with chains of group credentials, see column 10, lines 19-55. The teachings of Parker are relied upon for disclosing of credentials that contain user access rights and is organized by grouping (col. 2, lines 13-15,24-25, and 30-31. These rights listed in the privilege attribute certificates indicate which permissions the group of users is permitted. Parker further discloses that when the user wishes to access target applications, the privilege attribute certificate is presented to the particular application that lists the user's rights and a determination is made whether those users are permitted to access those applications, see column 1, lines 25-27 and 40-50.

It is argued by the applicant that neither Parker or Gasser disclose submitting proofs of group membership or group non-membership in the form of group certificates or lists. The examiner disagrees, Gasser is relied upon for disclosing group membership list that lists the members of a group, see column 11, lines 13-15 and 30-

35. Gasser et al additionally discloses of denying access to a first group which is a subgroup of a second group and only granting access to members of the second group who do not derive their membership in the second group through their membership in the first group, which is interpreted by the examiner as being non-membership, see abstract and column 24, lines 19-40. The groups may contain certificates which have been revoked and uncertified, indicating non-membership, see column 11, lines 9-15.

It is argued that Gasser or Parker fail to disclose "transmission to the server a request.....including the one or more chains of group credentials that prove membership in the nested group". The examiner respectfully disagrees, for it is disclosed by Gasser of a presenter located at a client which makes a request, transmitted across a network, for access to resources to a server controlling the system resources, see column 4, lines 26-29 & 55-64 and column 21, lines 43-47 & 54-58. Please refer above for the examiner's rebuttal pertaining to chains of group credentials that prove membership in the nested group.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gasser et al, U.S. Patent 5,220,604 in view of Parker, U.S. Patent 5,339,403.

As per claims 1,23,45,59,73,87,101, and 115, it is disclosed by Gasser et al of method, system, and sequence of program sequences (data signal embodied on a carrier wave) for a user (presenter) located on a workstation (client) which makes a request (transmitted across a network) for access to resources to a server (recipient) containing (controlling) the system resources (col. 4, lines 26-29 & 55-64 and col. 21, lines 43-47 & 54-58). The teachings consist of program sequences (computer data signal embodied as carrier waves) that are to be executed by a CPU (processor)(col. 2, lines 58-60). Members are listed in a certificate (credentials) that which is nested groups that include subgroups (chains) that are certified (proven/validated entity membership)(col. 10, lines 19-55). If a requesting user (presenter), located in the group, is found in the resource's (services) is found in the access control list, then access is granted (authorized) by making the resources available to the members (col. 4, lines 50-54, col. 10, lines 50-55 & 61-65, and col. 21, lines 54-58). The teachings of Gasser et al disclose of presenting the credentials, but they need to be looked up for comparison and the teachings are silent in disclosing of making the credentials available to the group. It is disclosed by Parker of privilege attribute certificates (credentials) that contain user access rights and is organized by grouping (col. 2, lines 13-15,24-25,& 30-31). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply means for listing user's credentials for fast comparison to determine user's access rights. The teachings of Parker recite of motivation by disclosing that a user only needs to be authenticated once and the privilege attribute certificate (credential) can be used several times to access

different applications (col. 1, lines 28-34). It is obvious that the teachings of Gasser et al would have found this beneficial in an attempt to speed up the process of accessing multiple applications as is disclosed by Parker.

As per claims 2,13,24,35,46,53,60,67,74,81,88,95,102,109,116, and 123, Gasser et al teaches of signed certificates (credentials) that verify (proof of) group membership (col. 11, lines 29-31).

As per claims 3,14,25,36,47,54,61,68,75,82,89,96,103,110,117, and 124, Gasser et al teaches of signed certificates that verify group membership (col. 11, lines 29-31).

As per claims 4,15,26,37,48,55,62,69,76,83,90,97,104,111,118, and 125, Gasser et al teaches of a group (membership) list that lists the members of a group (col. 11, lines 13-15 & 30-35).

As per claims 5,16,27,38,49,56,63,70,77,84,91,98,105,112,119, and 126, Gasser et al teaches of signed certificates (credentials) that verify (proof of) group membership (col. 11, lines 29-31). Gasser et al discloses of denying access to a first group which is a subgroup of a second group and only granting access to members of the second group who do not derive their membership in the second group through their membership in the first group (which is interpreted by the examiner as being non-membership)(see abstract, col. 24, lines 19-40). Gasser et al notes that groups may contain certificates which have been revoked and uncertified (indicating non-membership)(col. 11, lines 9-15).

As per claims 6,17,28,39,50,57,64,71,78,85,92,99,106,113,120, and 127, Gasser et al teaches of signed certificates that verify group membership (col. 11, lines 29-31).

Gasser et al discloses of denying access to a first group which is a subgroup of a second group and only granting access to members of the second group who do not derive their membership in the second group through their membership in the first group (which is interpreted by the examiner as being non-membership)(see abstract, col. 24, lines 19-40). Gasser et al notes that groups may contain certificates which have been revoked and uncertified (indicating non-membership)(col. 11, lines 9-15).

As per claims 7,18,29,40,51,58,65,72,79,86,93,100,107,114,121, and 128, Gasser et al teaches of a group that which lists the members of a group (col. 11, lines 13-15 & 30-35). Gasser et al discloses of denying access to a first group which is a subgroup of a second group and only granting access to members of the second group who do not derive their membership in the second group through their membership in the first group (which is interpreted by the examiner as being non-membership)(see abstract, col. 24, lines 19-40). Gasser et al notes that groups may contain certificates which have been revoked and uncertified (indicating non-membership)(col. 11, lines 9-15).

As per claims 8,19,30, and 41, Gasser et al discloses of a user (presenter) located on a workstation (client) which makes a request (across a network) to a server (recipient) containing system resources (services)(col. 21, lines 43-47).

As per claims 9,20,31, and 42, Gasser et al discloses of a user (presenter) located on a workstation (client) which makes a request (across a network which is on-line) to a server (recipient) containing system resources (services)(col. 21, lines 43-47).

As per claims 10,21,32, and 43, Gasser et al discloses of a user (presenter) located on a workstation (client) which makes a request (across a network which is on-line) to a server (recipient) containing system resources (services)(col. 21, lines 43-47). Also disclosed is the use of determining if a certificate has been revoked (through means of a revocation server)(col. 11, lines 7-8).

As per claims 11,22,33, and 44, Gasser et al discloses of a user (presenter) located on a workstation (client) which makes a request (across a network) to a server (recipient) containing system resources (services)(col. 21, lines 43-47).

As per claims 12,34,52,66,80,94,108, and 122, it is disclosed by Gasser et al of method, system, and sequence of program sequences (data signal embodied on a carrier wave) for a user (presenter) located on a workstation (client) which makes a request (transmitted across a network) for access to resources to a server (recipient) containing (controlling) the system resources (col. 4, lines 26-29 & 55-64 and col. 21, lines 43-47 & 54-58). The teachings consist of program sequences (computer data signal embodied as carrier waves) that are to be executed by a CPU (processor)(col. 2, lines 58-60). Members are listed in a certificate (credentials) that which is nested groups that include subgroups (chains) that are certified (proven/validated entity membership)(col. 10, lines 19-55). If a requesting user (presenter), located in the group, is found in the resource's (services) is found in the access control list, then access is granted (authorized) by making the resources available to the members (col. 4, lines 50-54, col. 10, lines 50-55 & 61-65, and col. 21, lines 54-58). Also taught by Gasser et al of a first group which is a subgroup of a second group and members of the



second group who do not derive their membership in the second group through their membership in the first group (which is interpreted by the examiner as being non-membership)(col. 24, lines 19-40). Gasser et al notes that groups may contain certificates which have been revoked and uncertified (indicating non-membership)(col. 11, lines 9-15). The groups are only secure as the entity that controls modification access to the group list (col. 11, lines 13-15) and it is interpreted by the examiner that access is provided to resources if they are non-members of a group since it is non-secure as is recited by Gasser et al. The teachings of Gasser et al disclose of presenting the credentials, but they need to be looked up for comparison and the teachings are silent in disclosing of making the credentials available to the group. It is disclosed by Parker of privilege attribute certificates (credentials) that contain user access rights and is organized by grouping (col. 2, lines 13-15,24-25,& 30-31). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply means for listing user's credentials for fast comparison to determine user's access rights. The teachings of Parker recite of motivation by disclosing that a user only needs to be authenticated once and the privilege attribute certificate (credential) can be used several times to access different applications (col. 1, lines 28-34). It is obvious that the teachings of Gasser et al would have found this beneficial in an attempt to speed up the process of accessing multiple applications as is disclosed by Parker.

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR

*CR*  
November 28, 2005

Christopher Revak  
Primary Examiner  
AU 2131

*CR*  
11/28/05